

ARGUMENTS/ REMARKS

In order to overcome the Examiner's claim rejection, the Applicant amends claim 1 by restricting the scope to only the preferred embodiments described in the specification and.

Claim 11 is added according to those embodiments described in application modes of the specification. Though the processes for manufacturing these compounds were not described in detail but their application results were clearly listed in Tables 3 and 4.

Since all the claimed aminothiol compounds have been disclosed in the specification in the form of structural formulae or ligands tables corresponding to a general formula, the Applicant believes that such amendments are acceptable without new matter.

As claim 1 is restricted as the preferred embodiments, claims 2-3 are cancelled.

Apparently, the aminothiol compounds disclosed in the amended claims 1 and 11 can be easily distinguished from Trost et al.'s disclosure in which R¹ is n-butyl, R² is n-butyl, R³, R⁴ and N form piperidyl, and R⁵ is methyl.

The Applicant believes that the foregoing is a complete response to the Office action, and thus respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles E. Baxley

90 John Street-Suite 309
New York, N.Y. 10038-3243
U.S.A.

Tel : (212) 791-7200
Fax : (212) 791-7276
E-Mail : ceb@hartbaxley.com